

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 2 are amended. The revision to claim 1 is supported, for example, at page 3, lines 28-29 in the specification. Claims 7-27 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 28-30 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicants request that the non-elected claims be maintained and reinstated if amended to track allowed subject matter of the elected claims. New claim 31 has been added. Claim 31 is supported, for example, at Figure 19 and at page 16, lines 13-18. Claims 1-6 and 28-31 are pending, with claims 1, 28 (withdrawn), and 30 (withdrawn) being independent.

The Examiner has objected to the specification as having an apparent error. Applicants respectfully point out that the statements objected to by the Examiner are not inconsistent. Depending on what part of the glass is being considered, increasing the thickness of the film can either increase or lower the heat produced. See, e.g., page 3, line 30 through page 4, line 34.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,786,784 (Nikodem). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed a window glass for a vehicle. The surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from the longer bus bar toward the shorter bus bar and the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than the heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance.

Nikodem does not disclose or suggest the arrangement recited in claim 1. Nikodem is directed to a heated window assembly. However, Nikodem does not teach or suggest that the surface resistance of a conductive film can vary as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the suggestion by Nikodem that the silver thickness or coating parameters can be adjusted does not suggest that a surface resistance can be varied within a single conductive film. Instead, the suggestion is only that the silver thickness or coating parameters can be changed as a whole.

Nikodem does not teach or disclose at least the above-described features. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Therefore, each of those claims is believed allowable for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: June 27, 2003



Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM:DTL